

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

POLICE PORTFOLIO - MINISTER

Question 1

With respect to Budget Paper No. 3 (p. 92) referencing 'Community Crime Prevention' grants, please provide evaluation reports and any other relevant information regarding the effectiveness of the programs funded by these grants.

(Asked by Ms Pennicuik, pages 9-10 of the transcript)

Reply:

Evaluation of the Community Crime Prevention Program

The Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) was commissioned to undertake a review of the strategic appropriateness and efficacy of the Community Crime Prevention Program (CCPP) in 2014. This review included the Community Safety Fund (CSF) and Public Safety Infrastructure Fund (PSIF), which were funded in the 2016/17 budget.

The AIC evaluation found that the CCPP was strongly regarded within the community and made a valuable contribution to the resourcing and promotion of effective crime prevention initiatives. Programs such as CSF and PSIF were found to be underpinned by "...*clean and continuing internal administrative efficiency improvements...and these reflect a close adherence to international good practice in the administration of a publically funded grants program (Hulme, 2014-15 p.viii)*".

The AIC evaluation concluded that the CCPP:

"is delivering an effective and efficient approach to sustainable crime prevention and is considered to be one of the most effective programs in Australia and internationally". (p.32)

The AIC evaluation report is available on the community crime prevention website at <https://www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au>.

In 2015 the former Parliamentary Secretary for Justice, Ben Carroll MP, led a review of the CCPP to consider its role in supporting local crime prevention and to build on the findings of the AIC evaluation. This review found that the CCPP is:

- an effective program, delivered in accordance with best practice principles;
- effective in building community knowledge about crime prevention by requiring evaluation of grants programs, establishing and maintaining a crime prevention website and communicating written and verbal crime prevention information to communities; and
- effective in developing partnerships with communities, in accordance with good governance principles for successful partnerships.

The review also found the Community Crime Prevention Unit's (CCPU's) grants administration to be fair and equitable and that the provision of grants funding is based on demonstrated need as grant applicants are required to provide evidence to support their proposed approach (pg. 15). The Parliamentary Secretary's report is available on the community crime prevention website at <https://www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au/resources/all-resources/community-crime-prevention-program-review-report>.

The grant programs were developed in accordance with the Department of Justice and Regulation's (DJR) Grants Management Framework, which defines the process for allocating grants and ensures that the administration and expenditure of grants are made in accordance with the department objectives and outcomes.

Evaluation of Programs/Initiatives

The CCPU undertakes various evaluation approaches both at the program and project level. This includes engaging external evaluators for larger grant programs such as the Youth Crime Prevention Grants, Place Based Targeted Grants and the Community Safety Networks project. Project level evaluations are conducted by grant recipients and reporting to CCPU or undertaken internally by CCPU.

CCPU commissioned the Department's Strategic Planning Unit to evaluate 6 funded projects over 2016–17. The findings of these evaluations are available on the CCPU <https://www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au/grants/graffiti-prevention-grants/summary-of-evaluation-findings-from-graffiti-prevention-projects>.

In December 2017, a survey was sent to 102 successful Graffiti Grant project applicants who delivered Graffiti Prevention Grants between 2012 and 2017. A total of 43 surveys were completed, with key findings:

- 87 per cent of respondents felt the graffiti prevention project to be effective in preventing or reducing illegal graffiti.
- 22 out of 39 sites indicated having no subsequent graffiti after installation of the mural/public art.

A link to the report can be found at www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au/grants/graffiti-prevention-grants/graffiti-prevention-grants-survey-report.

The following evaluation reports will be completed over the coming months:

- Place Based Targeted Grants outcomes report – undertaken by Urbis (August/September 2018).
- Youth Crime Prevention Grants interim report (internal) – undertaken by the Crime Statistics Agency (October 2018).
- Community Safety Networks interim report (internal) – undertaken by Monash University (November 2018).

Use of evaluation results

The CCPU has a strong commitment to evaluating its various grants programs, and to using evidence in the development of crime prevention policy and programs. Findings from monitoring and evaluation work informs the development of guidelines and parameters for each round of recurring grant programs, allowing these to remain responsive and relevant to community need.

The process evaluation of our pilot Place Based Targeted Grants program was used to inform the design of our Youth Crime Prevention Grants. Once the Youth Crime Prevention Grants evaluation is complete, this will influence the direction of future programs and contribute to the evidence base for youth crime prevention.

The CCPU also contributes to the broader Australian and international crime prevention evidence base by commissioning high quality evaluations and by providing evaluation resources to the public.

In 2017, CCPU commissioned the AIC to develop an evaluation toolkit for public safety infrastructure projects, which can be found at:

<https://www.crimeprevention.vic.gov.au/grants/public-safety-infrastructure-fund/crime-prevention-evaluation-toolkit>.

Question 2

In the 2018 state budget the Victorian government committed \$25 million towards community crime prevention initiatives, including in relation to youth crime. Are you able to provide any more information about where these initiatives will operate and what approaches will be used to engage and retain young people?

(Asked by Ms Shing on behalf of Ms Patten, page 15 of the transcript)

Reply:

The Victorian Government committed \$25 million to the CCPP in the 2018/19 State Budget over the next four years. This funding will be used to support and continue a range of grant programs, including:

- Youth Crime Prevention (YCPG)
- Community Safety Fund (CSF)
- Public Safety Infrastructure Fund (PSIF)

These grant programs operate state-wide. They primarily focus on situational and environmental crime prevention initiatives, such as locks, lights, urban design, CCTV and graffiti. However, the more targeted YCPG program aims to address offending behaviour and recidivism by young people by reducing the risk factors for offending and increasing protective factors.

The YCPG program is part of the Victorian Government's response to addressing offending behaviour by young people aged between 10-24 years who have had contact with, or have demonstrated risk of being involved with the criminal justice system. The program invests in priority areas that have higher levels of crime, higher proportions of recidivist youth offenders and socio-economic disadvantage.

In 2016/17 the Victorian Government invested \$10 million over two years to help communities develop and implement evidenced-based youth crime prevention strategies and strengthen their ability to intervene early and divert young people from criminal behaviour. This included \$9.1 million funding for community-led initiatives through three different streams. These projects are located state-wide in metro and regional areas, including:

- South East Metro: Dandenong, Casey, Frankston, Cardinia
- North West Metro: Brimbank, Hume, Wyndham, Melton, Darebin
- Barwon South West: Geelong
- Loddon Mallee: Bendigo, Mildura
- Gippsland: Latrobe, East Gippsland
- Grampians: Ballarat, Horsham
- Hume: Greater Shepparton, Wodonga

Many of our existing non youth-specific programs also include approaches to engaging young people. For example, the Graffiti Prevention program engages young people by requiring all projects with a public art or mural component to include a structured education program for any young people directly participating in the project. Well-designed anti-graffiti education and diversionary programs help raise the awareness of young people of the impacts of illegal graffiti and the legal and other consequences of engaging in graffiti vandalism.

Recipients of the 2018-19 round of the Graffiti Prevention Grants were announced on 18 June 2018. The Victorian Government awarded approximately \$420,000 to 19 graffiti prevention projects by Victorian councils, which will partner with their communities to deliver the initiatives over the next 12 months.

An overview of community crime prevention initiatives funded to date is available on the community crime prevention website. These projects can be broken down by program, financial year, region, and local government area.

Question 3

Does the minister know how much the passive alert detection dog program will cost for the year 2018–2019, and will the funding for this program be increased in the forthcoming years?

(Asked by Ms Shing on behalf of Ms Patten, page 15 of the transcript)

Reply:

In 2018-2019 the total funding for the additional eleven Passive Alert Detection dogs is \$2.322 million. Program funding is expected to be indexed in future years to maintain the program.

Question 4

In Budget Paper No. 3 (p. 92), the budget slates an increase of \$4.3 million for new equipment and training. I imagine this includes new ‘non-fatal’ weapons announced in the Age in March 2018 — a precise date has not been given. How much will the new non-fatal weapons cost in the forthcoming years? What is the split in the \$9.3 million between equipment and funding? And is the increase mainly going towards equipment or training? For example, is it 50-50 or is it 30-70?

(Asked by Ms Shing on behalf of Ms Patten, page 15 of the transcript)

Reply:

The 2018-19 Stage Budget provided funding of \$25 million over four years for critical police equipment and training. In 2018-2019, \$5 million has been provided. This will increase by \$4.3 million in 2019-2020, to \$9.3 million.

Subject to procurement, this funding will deliver approximately 520 Longarm Firearms for the Operational Response Unit, which is a highly visible and trained rapid response team tasked with tackling high-priority public safety, road policing and crime issues across the State.

Longarm Firearms give police a tactical advantage when responding to extreme incidents and provides community reassurance, particularly at times of heightened risk. This funding does not provide for new non-fatal weapons.

The funding will also deliver 6 sworn and 9 VPS staff, to provide specialised training and ensure safe practice of the four year project, and minor asset works to appropriately store and secure the Longarms.

The breakdown of the funding between equipment and training is as follows:

- 18.8 per cent for firearms and storage (approximately 520 Longarm Firearms, subject to procurement outcomes and ammunition storage and shipping);
- 9.6 per cent for project resources (including procurement staff, policy staff, vehicles, research and development); and
- 71.6 per cent for training resources (including project officers, safety officers, sworn training officers, travel allowance, training equipment, ammunition).

Question 5

With respect to livestock theft, please provide a breakdown of the following:

- a. **The current number of livestock theft incidents for the year to date.**
- b. **The number of convictions for livestock theft from 2017.**
- c. **The number of extraditions from other states in 2017 in relation to livestock theft.**

(Asked by Mr O'Brien, pages 20-21 of the transcript)

Reply:

- a) Crime Statistics Agency data from April 2017 to March 2018 indicates that there were 232 Burglary/Break and enter and Theft offences recorded where livestock were stolen.
- b) Victoria Police does not hold information on the number of convictions for livestock theft incidents. In relation to the status of the 232 offences recorded, Crime Statistics Agency data from April 2017 to March 2018, indicates that 10 of these resulted in an arrest or summons.
- c) Victoria Police does not hold information on extradition for livestock matters.

Question 6

With respect to Budget Paper No. 3 (p. 272) referencing performance measures for alcohol screen testing and alcohol limits, do the measures in the budget papers include the 250,000 tests that were reported in the media as false? Have they been taken out in terms of the actual target reach? Is this KPI of having to do so many tests in part causing the problem? Is there any more information you could supply?

(Asked by Ms Pennicuik, page 22 of the transcript)

Reply:

An internal investigation by Victoria Police, which analysed 1,500 preliminary breath test devices and more than 17.7 million tests over a five-year period, dating back to 2012, found 258,463 tests or 1.5 per cent of all tests had been falsified.

The 2017-18 target and expected outcome in the BP3 does not include any tests that have been reported as false. The 2017-18 targets and data only include the alcohol screening tests that were conducted by the Drug and Booze buses. There were no issues found with this data set.

Victoria Police conduct around 4 million breath tests across Victoria each year, which is well above previous BP3 measures and the 2018-19 target.

Victoria Police utilises a general deterrence methodology requiring a certain number of tests to be conducted each year. Victoria Police aims to test every Victorian driver annually. Police presence on the roads is a deterrent and reminder to drivers, which assists them to change their behaviour.

In response to community concern regarding reports of falsified tests, Victoria Police has appointed an external investigator, with contemporary knowledge of Victoria Police's practices and operating frameworks. The investigation will look to provide advice on:

- The root causes of the behaviour and remedies to monitor and prevent a recurrence.
- The underlying cultural and behavioural issues presented.
- Supervision and management practices that resulted in the behaviour continuing to go unchecked.
- Professional development and guidance required to remediate behavioural practices of this type.
- Aggravating circumstances that may need to be referred for further investigation.
- Victoria Police road safety policy drivers including state-wide systems and practice.

Question 7

With respect to the St Kilda Beach foreshore youth gang riot in December 2017, how many charges and what types of charges have been laid following this incident?

(Asked by Mr Smith, page 25 of the Police portfolio transcript)

Reply:

The incident that occurred on the foreshore of St Kilda beach and Acland Street on 13 December 2017 was subject to a police investigation. Charges are proceeding against two offenders as follows:

- A male offender will be charged with the principle offence of affray and two supplementary summary offences (assault with a weapon and behave in a riotous manner). The weapon offence relates to the use of chairs. This matter is proceeding by way of summons.
- A female offender will be charged with affray and behave in a riotous manner. This matter is proceeding by way of summons.